

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/752,375 570 7	12/29/2000	Futoshi Tanigawa	10059-365US (P23917-01)	1498
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD L.L.P.			EXAMINER	
2005 MARKE	ERCE SQUARE T STREET, SUITE 2200		CANTELMO, GREGG	
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-701			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1745	
			DATE MAILED: 10/01/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action		09/752,375	TANIGAWA ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
·	·	Gregg Cantelmo	1745
7	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet w	rith the correspondence address
herefore, nal rejection ondition fo	Y FILED 22 September 2003 FAILS TO PL further action by the applicant is required to on under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: or allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appen (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this (1) a timely filed amendment	s application. A proper reply to a ent which places the application in
	PERIOD FOR I	REPLY [check either a) or	b)]
a) 🛛 Th	e period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing d	ate of the final rejection.	
no ON 70 Extension e have beer e under 37 (e period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of thi event, however, will the statutory period for reply expirally CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY W 6.07(f). In so of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). To filed is the date for purposes of determining the perioders of the computation of the perioders of the computation of the computat	re later than SIX MONTHS from the AS FILED WITHIN TWO MONT the date on which the petition und dof extension and the correspore of the shortened statutory period office later than three months after than three months after than three months.	the mailing date of the final rejection. HS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP der 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension nding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension I for reply originally set in the final Office action; or
	otice of Appeal was filed on Appellan FR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 C		
. The	proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	because:	
(a) 🗌	they raise new issues that would require furt	ther consideration and/or s	search (see NOTE below);
(b) 🗌	they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	e below);	
—	they are not deemed to place the application ssues for appeal; and/or	n in better form for appeal	by materially reducing or simplifying the
(d) 🗌	they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	eling a corresponding num	nber of finally rejected claims.
B.□ Appl	icant's reply has overcome the following reje	ection(s):	
	y proposed or amended claim(s) wou celing the non-allowable claim(s).	ld be allowable if submitte	d in a separate, timely filed amendment
	a) \square affidavit, b) \square exhibit, or c) \boxtimes request fication in condition for allowance because: \S		en considered but does NOT place the
	affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be ed by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SC	OLELY to issues which were newly
	ourposes of Appeal, the proposed amendme anation of how the new or amended claims		
The :	status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	s:	
Clair	m(s) allowed:		
	m(s) objected to: <u>16-25</u> .		
Clai	m(s) rejected: <u>1,4,7,10 and 13</u> .		
Clai	m(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
. The	proposed drawing correction filed on	is a)☐ approved or b)☐	disapproved by the Examiner.
. Note	the attached Information Disclosure Statem	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)
O.∐ Othe	er:		
			·

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: It fails to provide convincing evidence that the prior art rejection of record does not render the claimed invention obvious.

In particular, Applicant argues that the secondary reference JP '508 is drawn to negative electrode materials and not positive electrode materials as recited in the instant claim and further in JP '701.

The prior art of JP '508 provides a teaching that by selecting the nickel hydroxide valence in an electrode of a rechargeable battery, the charing and discharging characteristics of the battery can be improved. One of ordinary skill in the art would have found such a teaching to be equally applicable to either positive or negative electrodes in rechargeable batteries which employ nickel as an active material for the purpose of optimizing the charge and discharge characteristics of the electrode having nickel as an active material.

Furthermore, given the ranges of nickel hydroxide (90-60 wt. percent) to nickel oxyhydroxide (10-40 wt. percent), the nickel in the hydroxide has a charge of +2 and the nickel in the oxyhydroxide has a charge of +3. Given the ranges set forth therein (about 60% from the hydroxide and about 40% from the oxyhydroxide) the average oxidation number of the nickel in the electrode will be above 2.5 and close to about, if not slightly above 2.6 which is within the critical range disclosed in the instant application

Mry Canth